

Schmiedeknecht, Maud; Wieland, Josef

**Working Paper**

## ISO 26000 as a Stakeholder Dialogue: An empirical study

KIeM Working Paper, No. 24/2006

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Konstanz Institut für Wertemanagement - KIeM, Hochschule Konstanz

*Suggested Citation:* Schmiedeknecht, Maud; Wieland, Josef (2006) : ISO 26000 as a Stakeholder Dialogue: An empirical study, KIeM Working Paper, No. 24/2006, Hochschule Konstanz Technik, Wirtschaft und Gestaltung (HTWG), Konstanz Institut für WerteManagement (KIeM), Konstanz

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/98772>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



Schmiedeknecht, M./ Wieland, J.

## **ISO 26000 as a Stakeholder Dialogue -** An empirical study

**KIEM**

Konstanz Institut für  
WerteManagement

Hochschule Konstanz – HTWG  
Technik, Wirtschaft und Gestaltung  
University of Applied Sciences  
Brauneggerstr. 55  
D – 78462 Konstanz  
Phone .49 .7531-206 404  
Fax .49 .7531-206 187  
E-Mail: [kiem@htwg-konstanz.de](mailto:kiem@htwg-konstanz.de)

final version published in:

Schmiedeknecht, M. and Wieland, J. (2007): 'ISO 26000 as a Network Discourse. An empirical study', in Wieland, J. (ed.): Governanceethik und Diskursethik - ein zwangloser Diskurs. Marburg: Metropolis, pp. 137-171.

## **ISO 26000 as a Stakeholder Dialogue**

### **An empirical study**

Maud Schmiedeknecht / Prof. Dr. Josef Wieland

This working paper is one part of a research project concerning the topics Social Responsibility, Stakeholder Theory and Network Governance supervised by Prof. Dr. habil. Josef Wieland and with the contribution of Maud Schmiedeknecht, both from the Konstanz Institute for Intercultural Management, Values and Communication at the Konstanz University of Applied Sciences.

The project is a joint research program of the Center for Business Ethics (ZfW) of the German Business Ethics Network (DNWE) and the Konstanz Institute for Intercultural Management, Values and Communication (KIeM). The authors are grateful to the German Federal Environment Ministry (BMU), the Anwenderrat für WerteManagement<sup>ZfW</sup> (AfW<sup>ZfW</sup>) and the University of Applied Sciences Konstanz for financially supporting this research project. At this point the authors would like to thank, above all, the Chair and Secretariat of the International Standard Organization/Technical Management Board Working Group Social Responsibility (ISO/TMB/WG SR) for allowing the survey to be performed. We are indebted to the respondents of the survey for their valuable contributions while taking part in the research project.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

<b>I. ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II. SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY – A SURVEY’S EMPIRICAL RESULTS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1. THE STANDARD DEVELOPING PROCESS FOR A “GUIDANCE DOCUMENT ON SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY” .....	5
2. RESEARCH METHOD AND APPROACH .....	6
3. INTERPRETATION OF THE SURVEY .....	8
3.1 <i>Information on the participants of the survey</i> .....	8
3.2 <i>Social responsibility</i> .....	9
3.3 <i>The ISO process – multi-stakeholder dialogue within a network</i> .....	13
<b>III. APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>27</b>
1. QUESTIONNAIRE .....	27

## **I. Abstract**

The focus of this part of the research project lies on the process of developing a Social Responsibility Standard within a network made up of various stakeholders.

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) is known as the world's leading institution for the development of standards. Besides setting standards in the fields of e.g. construction, agriculture and information technology, recently the Technical Management Board (TMB) of ISO proposed to further extend its activities by developing an international standard addressing the social responsibility of organizations. In 2004, a new Working Group was established as a multi-stakeholder group comprised of experts, who are nominated by ISO's members as well as interested international and regional organizations in order to provide for guidance in setting international standards on social responsibility.

In May 2006, the survey was conducted during the third conference of the ISO Working Group in Lisbon, Portugal. This particular empirical study has been designed on the one hand to investigate the motivation of organizations and their delegates to engage in social responsibility. On the other hand, the survey had the objective to evaluate the individual participants' current perception and assessment of the network's efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy, a so-called "snap-shot" of this ISO process<sup>1</sup>.

Overall, the empirical study shows that the organizations and their delegates, who have dealt with the topic SR for several years for diverse reasons, expect a tremendous effect by implementing ISO 26000 in their own organizations. Furthermore, the majority of respondents assess the decision-making process positively within the ISO process with respect to the criteria inclusive, fair, capacity building, legitimate and transparent. Difficulties concerning the distribution of stakeholder influences are being addressed. The results of the survey support the efforts to establish policies and procedures in order to encourage a balanced representation of stakeholders in terms of gender, geographic and stakeholder groups.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the following chapters the standard developing process for a Guidance Document on Social Responsibility will be named "ISO process".

## **II. Social Responsibility – A Survey’s Empirical Results**

### ***1. The standard developing process for a “Guidance Document on Social Responsibility”***

The following chapter describes an international multi-stakeholder network, which develops an ISO standard for social responsibility (SR) with actors from politics, business and society.

Since September 2004, an expert working group of the ISO has been dealing with the topic SR of organizations. This international working group consisting of hundreds of participants from 55 countries led by the national standards institutes of Brazil (ABNT) and Sweden (SIS) is developing an international standard until the end of 2008, which is supposed to serve as a guideline concerning social responsibility. This standard ISO 26000 aims at implementing and accelerating the development, realization, and improvement of determining factors for social responsibility in organizations. ISO 26000 is being developed for all kinds of organizations in any country of this world, including countries with emerging markets and developing countries. As the ISO standard will be designed as a guidance document, providing meaningful guidance to all kinds of organizations on SR issues, the standard is neither intended for third-party certification nor describes a management system.

The ISO considers the already existing principles and policies for social responsibility, especially the “Global Compact” initiative of the UN general secretary, the UN declaration on ecology and sustainable development (Rio de Janeiro) and the declaration on basic principles and labour rights by the International Labour Organization (ILO) as point of reference.

Stakeholders of this ISO process are organizations from all sectors of society: organizations for standardization, consumer organizations, governments, labour organizations, industry, non-governmental organizations, universities, etc. Furthermore, focus is placed on geographical and gender-based balances. In order to ensure a balanced representation among these diverse stakeholders, six stakeholder categories have been established in the working group: consumer, government, industry, labour, non-governmental organizations (NGO), service, support, research and others (SSRO). The ISO national member bodies may nominate up to six experts and six observers of each stakeholder group respectively to the working group. Those stakeholder representatives who hold an expert status have voting rights and hold a power of veto over resolutions and drafts issued by the working group by the consensus principle.

Additionally, the countries are entitled to delegate observers, who do not have a right to vote within the ISO process. International and regional organizations with an interest in the work of the working group may apply to the WG Secretariat for liaison membership. The organizations with liaison status may nominate up to two experts and two observers.

## ***2. Research method and approach***

In this chapter the results of the “survey on Social Responsibility of organizations” are being discussed and presented. They reflect experiences of actors taking part in the development of a guidance document on SR within the international process of standardization. The survey, though, does only represent a “snap-shot” within the ISO process. The content and topic of the research are on the one hand the motivation of organizations and their delegates to engage in social responsibility. On the other hand, the empirical study has the objective to investigate the individual participants’ perception and evaluation of the network’s effectiveness, efficiency, and legitimacy. Thus, it is not the networks’ actual effectiveness, efficiency, and legitimacy, but the involved stakeholders’ perception that is being analyzed.

From May 15th-19th, 2006, 315 persons participated in the third session of the “International Standard Organization/Technical Management Board Working Group Social Responsibility” (ISO/TMB WG SR) in Lisbon, Portugal.<sup>2</sup>

*Table 1: Participants of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ISO SR Plenary Meeting, Lisbon, Portugal*

	<b>Participants</b>
Members of the ISO Secretary	9
Experts and Observers (with Stakeholder category)	303
Experts and Observers (without Stakeholder category)	3
Total	315

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the official “presence List 3rd ISO SR Plenary Meeting, Lisbon, Portugal” which counts 313 participants. Altogether, there were 315 registered persons participating in the meeting in Lisbon.

During this conference 260 participants were asked by random sample<sup>3</sup> to contribute to the research by filling in a questionnaire. This study is based on a sample of 107 questionnaires being returned, which makes up a quota of 41%. This result could be achieved, because the authors of this study had the unique opportunity to directly perform the survey at the conference.<sup>4</sup>

The survey's objective can be derived from its concept: Its first part has been designed to gather information about the participants. On the one hand, descriptive data were collected such as the stakeholder category or the participants' status as either an expert or observer, on the other hand, their willingness to attend the upcoming meetings. The survey's second part is supposed to provide an understanding of the organizations' and their participants' motivation to deal with social responsibility as well as information about the consequences that derive from the future standard's application in their respective organizations. The survey's third part refers to the ISO process of developing a standard for social responsibility for organizations itself. This part aims to make a record of the individual participants' perceptions and evaluations regarding the network's effectiveness, legitimacy, and efficiency and the dialogues taking place within this process – a “snap-shot” of the process.

The standardized questionnaire<sup>5</sup> consists of six pages in the conference language English. Beforehand, it was possible to assure the relevance and comprehensibility of the questions by means of pre-tests<sup>6</sup>. Because of the sensitivity of the topic the data obtained were made anonymous. They were evaluated by using the statistics software SPSS. In the subsequent examination report, the study's results are used selectively: Following the structure of the questionnaire, we will begin with information on the 107 participants (3.1). Then, we will examine the results concerning the participating organizations objectives' with regard to social responsibility (3.2). In a last step, we will describe the results of the participants' perception and evaluation of the process (3.3).

---

<sup>3</sup> In the Lisbon Congress Center 260 forms were distributed to the participants of the ISO process per random sample after the sessions of the working group and task groups as well as during the breaks.

<sup>4</sup> The authors were able to distribute the questionnaires at a stand in the poster display area. This poster display area was a part of a foyer in the Lisbon Congress Center adjacent to the plenary room as well as the rooms of the working groups (Task group 3, 4 and 6). The participants of the survey could either return their questionnaire by throwing it into a ballot box at the stand or by sending it to the address of the KIeM.

<sup>5</sup> The questionnaire is made of 17 closed and 2 open questions.

<sup>6</sup> Participants of the pre-test were experts who took part in the first two ISO conferences in Salvador and Bangkok, but who were unable to come to the conference in Lisbon.



### 3. Interpretation of the survey

#### 3.1 Information on the participants of the survey

This study is based on a sample of 107 participants.<sup>7</sup> A classification by stakeholder category has the following result (cf. table 2):

Table 2: Participants of the survey - return by stakeholder category

Stakeholder categories	Participants of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> ISO SR Plenary Meeting <sup>8</sup>		Participants of the Survey	
Consumer	27	8.9%	7	6.5%
Government	57	18.8%	25	23.4%
Industry	76	25.1%	23	21.5%
Labour	29	9.5%	9	8.4%
Non-governmental Organization (NGO)	42	13.9%	14	13.1%
Service, Support, Research and Others (SSRO)	72	23.8%	29	27.1%
Total	303	100%	107	100%

Most of the survey's participants represented the stakeholder group *service, support, research and others* (27.1%), followed by *government* (23.4%) and *industry* (21.5%). The other stakeholder categories were represented by *non-governmental organizations* (13.1%), *consumer* (6.5%), and *labour* (8.4%). If one looks at the representation of stakeholders participating at the Lisbon conference and those participating in the survey, one sees that on an average 34% of each stakeholder group participated in the survey (consumer 26%, government 44%, industry 30%, labour 31%, NGO 33%, SSRO 40%). Stakeholders representing SSRO and government participated in the survey above average compared to the proportional distribution of stakeholder groups.

Table 3 shows that the questionnaire was mostly returned by those participants who held an *expert* status (81.3%), whereas of those participating as *observers* 18.7% took part in the survey. 63 individuals stated that they represent a *developed country* (61.2%), 40 represented

---

<sup>7</sup> N=260; n=107

<sup>8</sup> Data based on the official „presence List 3rd ISO SR Plenary Meeting, Lisbon, Portugal“.

a *developing country* (38.8%). Four individuals chose not to answer this question. Of those individuals participating 67 were *male* (62.6%) and 40 *female* (37.4%). On average, those individuals being interrogated took part in two ISO conferences on average. This is important in order to assess the significance of these data.

*Table 3: Participants of the survey – return by status*

Status	Participants of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> ISO SR Plenary Meeting		Participants of the Survey	
Expert	220	72.6%	87	81.3%
Observer	83	27.4%	20	18.7%
Total	303	100%	107	100%

### 3.2 Social responsibility

The second part of the questionnaire was designed to gather information about the question how long organizations have been dealing with social responsibility and which objectives are important for them in this regard.

The organizations participating in the ISO process have been engaged in SR for 7-9 years on average (cf. table 4):

*Table 4: Years dealing with the topic Social Responsibility*

Question: “Since how many years has your organization been dealing with the topic Social Responsibility?”

< 4 years	4-6 years	7-9 years	10-12 years	>12 years	Total
30	35	12	6	24	107
28%	32.7%	11.2%	5.6%	22.4%	100%

When comparing the statements with respect to the nationality of the respondents, one finds that most of those coming from developing countries have been dealing with SR *up to 4 years* (45%) and *4 to 6 years* (30%). 17.5% state that they have dealt with the topic in their organizations more than *12 years*. In comparison, in developed countries, the number of those dealing with SR *up to 4 years* equals 15.9% and those dealing with it *4 to 6 years* 36.5%. One

fourth of respondents of developed countries stated that they have worked with SR for at least *12 years* (23.8%). Some comments of the respondents state that their organizations have been engaged in aspects of the topic SR for a long time, e.g. labour rights or ecology, whereas the overall term “social responsibility” is mostly new.

Table 5 gives an overview of statements about possible reasons for the participating organizations to deal with the topic SR.

*Table 5: Reasons to deal with the topic Social Responsibility*

Statement: “Reasons why your organization deals with the topic SR:”

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	n.a. <sup>9</sup>	Total
...it is part of our organization's values and traditions.	58	29	6	-	11	104
	55.8%	27.9%	5.8%	-	10.6%	100%
...it is an investment in the social capital of a progressive society.	33	51	4	-	11	99
	33.3%	51.5%	4%	-	11.1%	100%
...we must comply with law.	39	30	9	4	18	100
	39%	30%	9%	4%	18%	100%
...we want to meet public and local expectations.	43	41	8	1	11	104
	41.3%	39.4%	7.7%	1%	10.6%	100%
...we must secure and improve the good reputation of the organization.	31	52	6	2	11	102
	30.4%	51%	5.9%	2%	10.8%	100%
...we have received impulses through inter-governmental initiatives (e.g. Global Compact, OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises,...).	10	46	16	5	25	102
	9.8%	45.1%	15.7%	4.9%	24.5%	100%
...we are securing the so-called „licence to operate“.	8	27	20	9	37	101
	7.9%	26.7%	19.8%	8.9%	36.6%	100%
...our organization wants to gain a competitive advantage.	16	28	17	5	35	101
	15.8%	27.7%	16.8%	5%	34.7%	100%

As the results show, organizations pursue mostly organizational and socio-political objectives: The answers concerning organizational objectives illustrate the following picture:

<sup>9</sup> Not applicable.

Most respondents agreed with the statement “*it is part of our organization’s values and traditions*” (55.8% agree strongly, 27.9% agree).

More than 80% agreed with the statement concerning the organization’s reputation: “*We must secure and improve the good reputation of the organization*” (30.4% agree strongly, 51% agree). Almost 70% stated that they are obliged to “*comply with law*” when dealing with SR (39% agree strongly, 30% agree).

The answers concerning socio-political objectives show a similar picture: 85% agreed that the reasons to deal with SR consist in an “*investment in the social capital of a progressive society*” (33.3% agree strongly, 51.5% agree). Approximately 80% stated that one reason to be involved with SR lies in their stakeholders’ expectations, “*to meet public and local expectations*” (41.3% agree strongly, 39.4% agree). Incentives set by intergovernmental initiatives encouraged 55% of all organizations to deal with SR (9.8% agree strongly, 45.1% agree).

Most respondents stated that apart from organizational and socio-political objectives their organizations do not pursue any immediate and short-term objectives and do not expect any direct advantages for being involved in SR topics. 15.8% agreed strongly and 27.7% agreed with the statement “*our organization wants to gain a competitive advantage*” (accumulated 44%). One third of all respondents (34.7%) declared this point not to be applicable, 22% disagreed with it (16.8% disagree, 5% disagree strongly). When comparing the different stakeholder categories the respondents belong to, one arrives at the following picture: The statement “*our organization wants to gain a competitive advantage*” is particularly approved in the stakeholder groups industry (accumulated 77%, 41% agree strongly, 36% agree) and NGO (accumulated 50%, 7% agree strongly, 43% agree). One third of the stakeholders representing government (accumulated 28%, 4.8% agree strongly, 23.8% agree), labour (33% agree) and SSRO (accumulated 38%, 17.2% agree strongly, 20.7% agree) agreed to the statement that their organizations want to gain a competitive advantage. No representative from the consumer group supports the statement about gaining a competitive advantage with SR activities.

One third of all respondents agreed with the statement “*we are securing the so-called licence to operate*” (7.9% agree strongly, 26.7% agree), whereas 29% could not agree with it (8.9% disagree, 19.8% disagree strongly). One third found this statement to be a reason to deal with SR not to be applicable (36.6%). When differentiating by stakeholder categories we can see that relatively many industry stakeholders agreed with the statement concerning the “*licence*

to operate” (accumulated 64%, 22.7% agree strongly, 40.9% agree) followed by the stakeholder groups government (accumulated 36%, 4.5% agree strongly, 31.8% agree) and NGO (accumulated 35%, 7.1% agree strongly, 28.6% agree). The other stakeholder groups were more reserved: labour (22.2% agree), SSRO (accumulated 17%, 3.6% agree strongly, 14.3% agree) and consumer (16.6% agree).

The following question referred to the standard’s impacts and thus to the effectiveness of the implementation of ISO 26000 in an organization. Most respondents expect a tremendous effect by implementing ISO 26000 in their own organizations, as the statements in table 6 show. For instance the respondents expect that standard ISO 26000 will “*increase the efficiency and effectiveness of all organization’s activities*” (accumulated 71%, 25% agree strongly, 46% agree) and to “*improve the organization’s reputation*” (accumulated 73%, 26.5% agree strongly, 47% agree).

*Table 6: Possible effects by implementing ISO 26000 in the future*

Statement: “The implementation of ISO 26000, Guidance on SR in your organization can...”

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	n.a.	Total
...increase the efficiency and effectiveness of all organization’s activities.	25	46	11	1	17	100
	25%	46%	11 %	10%	17%	100%
...improve risk management and the integrity of management.	28	38	11	4	20	101
	27.7%	37.6%	10.9%	4%	19.8%	100%
...sensitise employees to the topic of SR.	33	43	8	2	15	101
	32.7%	42.6%	7.9%	2%	14.9%	100%
...improve the organization’s reputation.	27	48	9	-	18	102
	26.5%	47.1%	8.8%	-	17.6%	100%
...contribute to the enhancement of SR in the organization’s sphere of influence.	30	51	5	1	16	103
	29.1%	49.5%	4.9%	1%	15.5%	100%
...shape and stabilise the process of SR in the organization.	26	48	7	2	18	101
	25.7%	47.5%	6.9%	2%	17.8%	100%

Table 7 documents the participants' expectation as to which organizations will implement the standard ISO 26000. The question focuses on the probability of an implementation. Significantly many respondents expect corporations to implement the standard: 88.5% name “*multinational corporations*”, 76.9% mention “*major national corporations*”, 45.2% expect “*small and medium sized enterprises*” to act. The ranking continues as follows (cf. table 7):

*Table 7: Organizations implementing ISO 26000*

Question: “In your opinion, which of the following organizations will most probably apply this guidance document on SR (ISO 26000) in their organization?”

(Multiple answers were permitted. Total: 104 participants; 100%)

1. Multinational corporations	92	(88.5%)
2. Major national corporations	80	(76.9%)
3. Small and medium sized enterprises	47	(45.2%)
4. Public services	45	(43.3%)
5. Non-governmental Organizations (NGO)	31	(29.8%)
6. Governmental organizations	29	(27.9%)
7. Consumer organizations	24	(23.1%)
8. Trade unions	22	(21.2%)

Especially industry stakeholders stated in the commentary line, that the standard would most probably be implemented by all of the above listed organizations. These results are interesting against the background of the preceding chapter in which we explained that the ISO standard's main goal is its applicability for all kind of organizations in all countries of this world.

### **3.3 The ISO process – multi-stakeholder dialogue within a network**

The third part of the questionnaire has been designed to gather information about the process of developing a standard on SR. At the beginning of this chapter we will discuss the question, which objectives organizations pursue by participating in the ISO process. Then, we will analyze some of the results regarding the participants' current perception and assessment of the network's efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy.

Table 8 illustrates the respondents' assessment of their organization's reasons to participate in the development of this standard.

*Table 8: Reasons for participation in the ISO process*

Statement: "The targets of your organization participating in this ISO process on SR are..."

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	n.a.	Total
...to play a part in developing a guidance document on SR.	64	40	-	-	2	106
	60.4%	37.7%	-	-	1.9%	100%
...to communicate with different stakeholder categories about SR.	38	55	8	2	2	105
	36.2%	52.4%	7.6%	1.9%	1.9%	100%
...to develop partnerships and strengthen networks.	35	56	8	-	4	103
	34%	54.4%	7.8%	-	3.9%	100%
...to represent national interests.	31	34	25	2	9	101
	30.7%	33.7%	24.8%	2.0%	8.9%	100%
...to avoid solutions imposed by law.	14	18	32	26	8	98
	14.3%	18.4%	32.7%	26.5%	8.2%	100%
...to represent the organization's interests.	29	50	11	3	9	102
	28.4%	49.0%	10.8%	2.9%	8.8%	100%
...to contribute in developing an important guidance document on SR.	58	44	2	-	-	104
	55.8%	42.3%	1.9%	-	-	100%
...to learn about social responsibility.	27	48	20	3	5	103
	26.2%	46.6%	19.4%	2.9%	4.9%	100%
...to express perspectives and values in an important forum.	34	52	10	3	3	103
	33.3%	51.0%	9.8%	2.9%	2.9%	100%

A common reason for participation is, in the first place, a contribution of expert knowledge. 98% of all participants stated that they want "*to play a part in developing a guidance document on SR*" (60.4% agree strongly, 37.7% agree). Furthermore, the respondents expect the standard to be important for organizations. 98% agreed with the statement "*to contribute in developing an important guidance document on SR*" (55.8% agree strongly, 42.3% agree). We can assume that the attending organizations see a chance in this ISO process in mobilizing and pooling resources and competences concerning SR.

Secondly, most participants agreed with the statement “*to communicate with different stakeholder categories about SR*” (36.2% agree strongly, 52.4% agree) and “*to develop partnerships and strengthen networks*” (34% agree strongly, 54.4% agree). There seems to be a great disposition to communicate and to build networks, both of which are very important for negotiation networks like this one. A readiness “*to learn about social responsibility*” is shared by 73% of all participants (26.2% agree strongly, 46.6% agree). However, one fifth cannot agree with this statement (19.4% disagree, 2.9% disagree strongly).

The participants’ opinions differ more significantly with respect to their motivation to take part in the ISO process in order to represent national, organizational interests and organization values. 64% of all respondents agreed “*to represent national interests*” (30.7% agree strongly, 33.7% agree), but a considerable number, almost a quarter, of all respondents did not agree (accumulated 27%) or thought this statement not to be applicable (8.9%). When comparing the different stakeholder categories regarding the disagreement, half of the labour (44.4% disagree, 11.1% disagree strongly) and NGO representatives (35.7% disagree, 7.1% disagree strongly, 14.3% not applicable) disagree with this statement. The other stakeholder groups are of the following opinion: consumer (28.6% disagree), government (13% disagree, 17.4% not applicable), industry (19% disagree, 14.3% not applicable) and SSRO (25.7% disagree).

77% agreed “*to represent the organization’s interests*” (28.4% agree strongly, 49% agree), one third did not agree (10.8% disagree, 2.9% disagree strongly) or considered this point not to be applicable (8.8%). This answer category is also important with respect to the stakeholder categories: All consumer representatives agreed to represent their organization’s interest by taking part in the ISO process (43% agree strongly, 57% agree). Also industry (accumulated 90%, 40% agree strongly, 50% agree) and NGO representatives (accumulated 85%, 21% agree strongly, 64% agree) did accept this point very well. Labour (77% accumulated, 55% agree strongly, 22% agree), government (68% accumulated, 18% agree strongly, 50% agree), and SSRO representatives (62% accumulated, 18% agree strongly, 46% agree) reacted in comparison more reluctantly. The 84% of the participants approving the statement “*to express perspectives and values in an important forum*” can be assessed similarly (33.3% agree strongly, 51% agree).



Many participants disagree with the reason to participate in the ISO process in order “*to avoid solutions imposed by law*”. 59% of the respondents (32.7% disagree, 26.5% disagree strongly) reject a motivation to participate in order to avoid the development of national laws, 8.2% do not accept this to be applicable. Only 33% agree to the statement (14.3% agree strongly, 18.4% agree).

As table 9 shows, the respondents assess criteria such as “inclusive”, “fair”, “capacity building”, “legitimate”, “transparent”, “a dialogue” positively with respect to the modes of decision-making process within the ISO process.

*Table 9: Assessment of the ISO process*

Statement: “In your opinion, this ISO process on SR is...”

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	n.a.	Total
... inclusive (open to all relevant stakeholders).	38	54	13	2	-	107
	35.5%	50.5%	12.1%	1.9%	-	100%
...fair (assures stakeholders that the process does not prejudice outcomes).	18	67	14	2	2	103
	17.5%	65%	13.6%	1.9%	1.9%	100%
...capacity building (strengthening and developing skills and resources of involved people and organizations).	26	61	15	1	-	103
	25.2%	59.2%	14.6%	1%	-	100%
...legitimate (procedures are democratic).	20	63	14	3	2	102
	19.6%	61.8%	13.7%	2.9%	2%	100%
...transparent (information is accessible and equally distributed).	29	56	14	6	-	107
	27.6%	53.3%	13.3%	5.7%	-	100%
...a dialogue (decisions are the output of stakeholder discussions).	22	73	10	2	-	107
	20.6%	68.2%	9.3%	1.9%	-	100%

Inclusiveness in connection with stakeholder dialogues requires the process to be open to all relevant stakeholders. Most respondents perceived the ISO process as “*inclusive*” (35.5% agree strongly, 50.5% agree). In cases of rejections of the process’ inclusiveness (12.1%

disagree, 1.9% disagree strongly), this is partially explained by comments such as “lack of funding to many stakeholders” which impedes an adequate participation.

Most respondents also thought of the ISO process on SR as “*legitimate*” (accumulated 81%, 19.6% agree strongly, 61.8% agree). One has to take into account, though, that in any case organizations and individuals attribute legitimacy to the ISO process already by actively attending its sessions.

82% experienced the process as “*fair*” insofar as it assures no prejudged outcome (17.5% agree strongly, 65% agree).

A “*transparent*” process should guarantee that information is accessible and equally distributed and therefore can assure democratic control together with precise responsibilities. The participants’ assessment of the transparency factor in the ISO process is as follows: 81% agreed overall (27.6% agree strongly, 53.3% agree), whereas the rest disagreed (13.3% disagree, 5.7% disagree strongly). One person remarks that the process is insofar transparent as “information is ‘accessible’, but not as it is ‘equally distributed’”.

The process’ discursive quality is expressed by the free formation of opinion and decision-making. 88% of all respondents perceive the process as a “*dialogue*” (20.6% agree strongly, 68.2% agree). There was one remark that besides the official forum in working groups and task group sessions this dialogue “and much of the work is still carried out in the corridors”.

The following question, which is documented in table 10, aims at assessing the participants’ perception of the *stakeholders’ influences on the ISO* process. Special emphasis was given to the aspect of equal influence.

*Table 10: Influence of stakeholder groups on the ISO process*

Question: “Do you think that all stakeholder groups have the same influence on this ISO process on SR?”  
(Total: 107 answers; 100%)

<b>Yes</b> , all stakeholder groups have the same influence on this ISO process.	24	(22.4%)
<b>No</b> , stakeholder groups have a different influence on this ISO process.	83	(77.6%)

It is significant that two-thirds of all respondents have the feeling that the stakeholder groups do not exert the same influence on the ISO process (77.6%). When asked about which stakeholder group influences the process most, the respondents' answers give the following picture:

*Table 11: High influence of stakeholders groups on ISO process*

Question: "If no: In your opinion, which stakeholder groups have a high influence on this ISO process?"  
(Total: 83 answers; 100%)

1. Industry	74	(89.2%)
2. Non-governmental Organization (NGO)	29	(34.9%)
3. Labour	18	(21.7%)
3. Service, support, research and others (SSRO)	18	(21.7%)
4. Consumer	17	(20.5%)
5. Government	10	(12.0%)

The stakeholder group industry is the one attributed by far the highest influence (74), followed by NGO (29). Third and fourth are labour and SSRO, each mentioned 18 times, and the consumer group with 17 mentions. Participants perceive the influence of the stakeholder group government as least important (named 10 times).

The respondents had the possibility to give reasons why they assessed some stakeholder groups to be more influential than others. This question was an open question. Answers can be grouped as follows: i) different resources, ii) different experiences in networks and processes, iii) different position regarding agenda-setting.

Ad i) Reasons for uneven distribution of influence of different stakeholder groups in the ISO process were mostly assessed by terms of *different resources*. On the one hand, *financial resources* of different stakeholder groups vary significantly, which can be interpreted from answers like "resources to participate continuously", "possibility to participate is 'bigger' due to financial capabilities". On the other hand, varying *human resources* were frequently mentioned as reasons for an unequal distribution of influence: "...availability of human resources", "just look at the number of experts of the different groups", "under-representation and over-representation of stakeholder" and "composition of mirror committees is not balanced".

Ad ii) Other reasons for uneven distribution of influence were frequently *different backgrounds and experiences of stakeholders within networks* as well as *varying quality of collaboration within stakeholder groups*. Concerning the collaboration, respondents have stated in commentaries that some stakeholder groups could develop a strong and concerted position due to their good teamwork: “well organized within stakeholder groups” and “good management and communication between the groups”.

Ad iii) The last factor that can be conceived as important concerning the levels of influence within the ISO process was the respondents perception of *different bargaining positions* of the stakeholder groups. The high influence of the labour group for instance was attributed to the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between ISO and ILO. One commentary concerning this point was: “labour are small but have a key bargaining position through the ILO MoU”. Industry was also mentioned as obtaining a strong negotiating position, because it would be most strongly affected by the standard, which is hinted at by commentaries such as these: “although we’re preparing SR guidance, focus/target/key relevance is CSR” and “industries are the organizations impacted the most by social responsibility”.

Table 12 depicts the respondents' assessment regarding selected aspects within the ISO process.

*Table 12: Advantages and disadvantages within the ISO process*

Question: "From your perspective, are the following aspects an advantage or disadvantage at this ISO process on SR?"

	strong advanta ge	advanta ge	neutral	disadva ntage	strong dis- advanta ge	n.a.	Total
Developing a guidance document for all types of organizations and all countries	38	41	9	14	1	1	104
	36.5%	39.4%	8.7%	13.5%	1%	1%	100%
Having all relevant stakeholders participate	52	48	3	2	1	-	106
	49.1%	45.3%	2.8%	1.9%	0.9%	-	100%
Providing a platform for formulating stakeholders' interests	36	50	16	2	-	-	104
	34.6%	48.1%	15.4%	1.9%	-	-	100%
Designing a standard together with „developed“ and „developing countries“	59	35	8	4	-	-	106
	55.7%	33%	7.5%	3.8%	-	-	100%
Wide range of knowledge of SR content	35	53	14	3	-	1	106
	33%	50%	13.2%	2.8%	-	0.9%	100%
Procedures for effective decision-making	18	45	24	7	4	4	102
	17.6%	44.1%	23.5%	6.9%	3.9%	3.9%	100%
Procedures for legitimate decision-making	19	45	26	6	3	4	103
	18.4%	43.7%	25.2%	5.8%	2.9%	3.9%	100%
Strict time frame	6	27	34	25	6	3	101
	5.9%	26.7%	33.7%	24.8%	5.9%	3%	100%

As the preceding question on the inclusiveness of the ISO process already has shown, 94% of all participants agree with the statement that it is an advantage of the ISO process “*having all relevant stakeholders participate*” in it (49.1% agree strongly, 45.3% agree). The fact that the standard is being designed “*together with ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ countries*” was perceived as especially positive (55.7% agree strongly, 33% agree).

The readiness for dialogue is being reflected in consent about “*providing a platform for formulating stakeholders’ interests*” (accumulated 83%). Also 83% appreciate the existence and availability of “*wide range of knowledge of SR content*” as advantageous, 13% hold a neutral opinion regarding this question. Concerning the impact of the future standard, 76% of all respondents say that it is an advantage to develop “*a guidance document for all types of organizations and all countries*”. 9% have a neutral opinion about this point, whereas 14% think it is a disadvantage.

Opinions about the *procedures for effective and legitimate decision-making* were more differentiated: 18% think it is a great advantage and 44% conceive it as an advantage that the ISO has established effective and legitimate procedures for decision-making. One fourth of all respondents were neutral about this question.

The last question about the “*strict time frame*” reveals that 33% think the time frame is an advantage (5.6% strong advantage, 26.7% advantage) whereas 31% find it to be a disadvantage (24.8% disadvantage, 5.9% strong disadvantage). There were no differences between developing and developed countries with respect to this question.

Within the framework of this study participants were also asked about the requirements for a successful stakeholder dialogue in terms of individual abilities of the stakeholders involved as well as preconditions for a successful dialogue concerning process requirements.

Table 13 describes a ranking of individual abilities that are important for a successful stakeholder dialogue in the eyes of the respondents. The most important was “*to have relevant expertise and professional experience in SR*” (73.8%) and “*to be able to discuss controversial problems*” (57.9%) which means a general professional competence and ability to communicate. “*Special knowledge of and experience in ISO processes*”, i.e. standardization processes is perceived as positive by 34.6%.

*Table 13: Individual abilities for a successful stakeholder dialogue*

Question: “In your opinion, which are the three most important abilities of participants for the success of this ISO process on SR?” (Multiple answers were permitted. Total: 107 participants; 100%.)

1. to have relevant expertise and professional experience in SR	79	(73.8%)
2. to be able to discuss controversial problems	62	(57.9%)
3. to have special knowledge of and experience in ISO processes	37	(34.6%)
4. to be action oriented	27	(25.2%)
5. to be adaptive	26	(24.3%)
5. to have intercultural competences	26	(24.3%)
6. to be consultative	25	(23.4%)
7. to think in networks	21	(19.6%)
8. to have bargaining skills	13	(12.1%)

Respondents added to those abilities named in table 13 the following ones in the comment line (in quotation marks):

- General language skills (“communication skills”, “speak clearly”, “to express ideas and positions clearly”, “foreign language skills”, “English language”),
- Participants’ values (“integrity”), and
- Ability to listen to others and to understand their positions as well as to accept the better argument (“to be able to listen to others and to change opinion if others have better ideas”, “consensus oriented”, “compromising”, “open minded”, “to be dialogue driven and see the big picture, not just sector interests”).

The next table 14 deals with the question concerning the three most important preconditions for a successful stakeholder dialogue concerning the process itself.

*Table 14: Preconditions on the process level for a successful stakeholder dialogue*

Question: “Generally speaking, what are the three most important basic requirements for the success of a stakeholder dialogue?” (Multiple answers were permitted. Total: 103 participants; 100%.)

1. Effective communication between stakeholders	54	(52.4%)
2. Equity in communication between stakeholders	39	(37.9%)
3. Concept of consensus	32	(31.1%)
4. Diversity of expertise, talents and interests	31	(30.1%)
5. Leadership	27	(26.2%)
5. Expert knowledge	27	(26.2%)
6. Accountability of participants	25	(24.3%)
6. Efficiency of process and procedures	25	(24.3%)
7. Legitimacy	19	(18.4%)
8. Financial resources	16	(15.5%)
9. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms	11	(10.7%)

The communication is the crucial precondition for the respondents, be it “*effective communication between stakeholders*” (52.4%) or “*equity in communication between stakeholders*” (37.9%). Third most important requirement is the “*concept of consensus*” (31.1%). “*Diversity of expertise, talents and interests*” is also experienced as being very important for a successful dialogue (30.1%). Process oriented mechanisms such as “*monitoring and evaluation mechanisms*” constitute an essential precondition only for 10%.



Regarding the assessment and perception of the ISO process the following conclusions can be drawn against the background of those criteria for a successful dialogue listed in table 14 (cf. table 15):

*Table 15: Assessment of the stakeholder dialogue at the ISO process*

Question: “Do the following requirements for a successful stakeholder dialogue apply to this ISO process on SR?”

	strongly applies	applies	applies to some extent	does not apply	Total
Accountability of participants	19	51	21	8	99
	19.2%	51.5%	21.2%	8.1%	100%
Concept of consensus	36	48	17	2	103
	35%	46.6%	16.5%	1.9%	100%
Diversity of expertise, talents and interests	43	52	7	1	103
	41.7%	50.5%	6.8%	1%	100%
Effective communication between stakeholders (language, intercultural communication,...)	39	35	26	2	102
	38.2%	34.3%	25.5%	2%	100%
Efficiency of process and procedures	22	47	24	7	100
	22%	47%	24%	7%	100%
Equity in communication between stakeholders	26	44	23	7	100
	26%	44%	23%	7%	100%
Expert knowledge	35	45	20	1	101
	34.7%	44.6%	19.8%	1%	100%
Financial resources	29	23	37	13	102
	28.4%	22.5%	36.3%	12.7%	100%
Leadership	26	41	28	5	100
	26%	41%	28%	5%	100%
Legitimacy	26	47	21	4	98
	26.5%	48%	21.4%	4.1%	100%
Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms	12	37	34	13	96
	12.5%	38.5%	35.4%	13.5%	100%

Most respondents acknowledged the existence and availability of a “*diversity of expertise, talents and interests*” (accumulated 92%, 41.7% strongly applies, 50.5% applies) and “*expert knowledge*” (accumulated 79%, 34.7% strongly applies, 44.6% applies). They also mostly

agreed with respect to the “*concept of consensus*” (accumulated 81.6%, 35% strongly applies, 46.6% applies).

There was a more differentiated result concerning the topics finances and evaluation mechanism. Half of the respondents found the “*financial resources*” to be sufficient (28.4% strongly applies, 22.5% applies), whereas one third thought this applies to some extent (36.3%). 12.7% said that this category did not apply to the ISO process at all. There was also one half who acknowledged the existence of “*monitoring and evaluation mechanisms*” in the ISO process (12.5% strongly applies, 38.5% applies), whereas one third thought this only to apply to some extent (35.4%) and 13.5% found this category not to be applicable.

Finally, the participants were asked whether or not their expectations have been met so far concerning the stakeholder dialogue of the ISO process. There were diverse responses to the question (cf. table 16).

*Table 16: Participants’ satisfaction with the stakeholder dialogue*

Question: “Has the stakeholder dialogue of this ISO process on SR met your expectations so far?”

completely	to a great extend	satisfactorily	to a small degree	not at all	Total
4	15	58	24	4	105
3.8%	14.3%	55.2%	22.9%	3.7%	100%

Table 16 shows that most of those taking part in the survey experienced the stakeholder dialogue so far as “*satisfactory*” (55.2%). 18% assessed the dialogue of the ISO process as above-average, while 14.3% stated “*to a great extent*” and 3.8% “*completely*”, whereas 27% of the respondents expressed that their expectations have not been met completely with the category “*to a small degree*” (22.9%) or “*not at all*” (3.8%). Reasons for this evaluation are varied and mostly reflected in the answers before.

All in all, the ISO 26000 multi-stakeholder process to develop a Guidance Document on SR within a network is a challenge in every respect.

A large number of participating countries and liaison organizations exchange their point of view concerning the topic Social Responsibility. Those experts from various stakeholder groups and countries have to focus on reaching consensus. Beside the broad stakeholder involvement based on the six stakeholder categories, challenges within the process such as funding arrangements and strict time frame as well as challenges concerning the stakeholder dialogue such as multilingualism arise. The ISO process of developing a standard is an opportunity to demonstrate the world that consensus within a heterogeneous group regarding SR is possible.

### III. Appendix

#### 1. Questionnaire

## Survey on Social Responsibility ISO Process

This short questionnaire is part of a research project on social responsibility conducted by Maud Schmiedeknecht under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Josef Wieland, University of Applied Sciences Konstanz (Germany). Additionally, the results of the survey will be forwarded to the ISO Secretariat.

The project looks into the process of network building and multi-stakeholder dialogues. As you are an expert or observer participating in this ISO process on Social Responsibility, your contribution is very valuable. The questionnaire is split into three main parts, namely the general section, a section on social responsibility and a section on ISO process. You are mainly requested to tick (☐) the appropriate answer, and only sometimes to describe a situation. If the space provided is insufficient, please use the space at the end of the questionnaire. Please keep continuing even, if you can only answer parts of the questionnaire. Overall, it will take **about 10 minutes**.

Data protection: Please be assured that the data and information you provide will be treated strictly confidential. Anonymity will be guaranteed, no personal data or information that might identify you as a respondent will be passed on to a third party.

Please return this questionnaire in the "box" provided in the poster display area in the Lisbon Congress Centre or return by post, fax or e-mail to the address below. **Thank you very much for your cooperation and support**

Maud Schmiedeknecht

Konstanz Institute for Intercultural Management, Values and Communication  
Brauneggerstr. 55. D – 78462 Konstanz / Phone: +49 7531 206 637 / Fax: +49 7531 206 87 637  
Mail: schmiedeknecht@htwg-konstanz.de

### Section 1: General Statistics

#### 01. Which stakeholder group do you represent?

- |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Consumer   | <input type="checkbox"/> Labour                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Government | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-governmental Organization (NGO)          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industry   | <input type="checkbox"/> Service, support, research and others (SSRO) |

#### 02. Are you an "expert" or an "observer" (according to the ISO definition)?

- |                                 |                                   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Expert | <input type="checkbox"/> Observer |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

#### 03. Are you representing a "developed country" or "developing country" (according to the ISO definition)?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Developed country | <input type="checkbox"/> Developing country |
|--|---|

#### 04. Which of the following meetings of ISO/TMB/WG on Social Responsibility (SR) have you attended?

(Please tick all appropriate boxes)

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bahia, Brazil<br>(Feb. 2005) | <input type="checkbox"/> Bangkok, Thailand<br>(Sep. 2005) | <input type="checkbox"/> Lisbon, Portugal<br>(May 2006) |
|---|---|---|

#### 05. Will you take part in the subsequent meeting of ISO/TMB/WG on SR in autumn 2006?

- |                              |                             |                                |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|

#### 06. What is your sex?

- |                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Male | <input type="checkbox"/> Female |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

## Section 2: Social Responsibility (SR)

### 07. Since how many years has your organization been dealing with the topic Social Responsibility?

☐ <4 years

☐ 4–6 years

☐ 7–9 years

☐ 10–12 years

☐ >12 years

### 08. Reasons why your organization deals with the topic SR:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

(Please tick the appropriate box in each line)

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	not applicable
...it is part of our organization's values and traditions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...it is an investment in the social capital of a progressive society.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...we must comply with law.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...we want to meet public and local expectations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...we must secure and improve the good reputation of the organization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...we have received impulses through inter-governmental initiatives (e.g. Global Compact, OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises,...).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...we are securing the so-called „licence to operate“.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...our organization wants to gain a competitive advantage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### 09. The implementation of ISO 26000, Guidance on SR in your organization can...

How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

(Please tick the appropriate box in each line.)

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	not applicable
...increase the efficiency and effectiveness of all organization's activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...improve risk management and the integrity of management.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...sensitise employees to the topic of SR.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...improve the organization's reputation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...contribute to the enhancement of SR in the organization's sphere of influence.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...shape and stabilise the process of SR in the organization.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**10. In your opinion, which of the following organizations will most probably apply this guidance document on SR (ISO 26000) in their organization?**

(Please tick all appropriate boxes)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Consumer organizations      | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-governmental Organizations (NGO) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Governmental organizations  | <input type="checkbox"/> Public services                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major national corporations | <input type="checkbox"/> Small and medium sized enterprises   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Multinational corporations  | <input type="checkbox"/> Trade unions                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                |   |

## Section 3: ISO Process - Developing a Guidance Document on SR

**11. The targets of your organization participating in this ISO process on SR are...**

How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

(Please tick the appropriate box in each line)

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	not applicable
...to play a part in developing a guidance document on SR.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to communicate with different stakeholder categories about SR.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to develop partnerships and strengthen networks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to represent national interests.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to avoid solutions imposed by law.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to represent the organization's interests.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to contribute in developing an important guidance document on SR.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to learn about social responsibility.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to express perspectives and values in an important forum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**12. In your opinion, this ISO process on SR is...**

How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

(Please tick the appropriate box in each line)

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	not applicable
...inclusive (open to all relevant stakeholders).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...fair (assures stakeholders that the process does not prejudice outcomes).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...capacity building (strengthening and developing skills and resources of involved people and organizations).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...legitimate (procedures are democratic).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...transparent (information is accessible and equally distributed).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...a dialogue (decisions are the output of stakeholder discussions).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**13. Do you think that all stakeholder groups have the same influence on this ISO process on SR?**

☐ **Yes**, all stakeholder groups have the same influence on this ISO process.

☐ **No**, stakeholder groups have a different influence on this ISO process.

➔ If no: In your opinion, which stakeholder groups have a high influence on this ISO process?  
(Please tick all appropriate boxes)

☐ Consumer

☐ Labour

☐ Government

☐ Non-governmental Organization (NGO)

☐ Industry

☐ Service, support, research and others (SSRO)

Reason(s): \_\_\_\_\_

**14. From your perspective, are the following aspects an advantage or disadvantage at this ISO process on SR?**

(Please tick the appropriate box in each line)

	strong advantage	advantage	neutral	dis- advantage	strong dis- advantage	not applicable
Developing a guidance document for all types of organizations and all countries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Having all relevant stakeholders participate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing a platform for formulating stakeholders' interests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Designing a standard together with „developed“ and „developing countries“	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wide range of knowledge of SR content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Procedures for effective decision-making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Procedures for legitimate decision-making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strict time frame	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**15. In your opinion, what are the three most important abilities of participants for the success of this ISO process on SR?**

(Please tick three abilities)

☐ to be action oriented

☐ to have intercultural competences

☐ to be able to discuss controversial problems

☐ to think in networks

☐ to be adaptive

☐ to have bargaining skills

☐ to have relevant expertise and professional experience in SR

☐ to have special knowledge of and experience in ISO processes

☐ to be consultative

☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**16. Generally speaking, what are the three most important basic requirements for the success of a stakeholder dialogue?**

(Please tick three requirements)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accountability of participants                | <input type="checkbox"/> Financial resources                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Concept of consensus                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Diversity of expertise, talents and interests | <input type="checkbox"/> Legitimacy                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Efficiency of process and procedures          | <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Equity in communication between stakeholders  | <input type="checkbox"/> Effective communication between stakeholders |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Expert knowledge                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                 |

**17. Do the following requirements for a successful stakeholder dialogue apply to this ISO process on SR?**

(Please tick the appropriate box in each line)

	strongly applies	applies	applies to some extent	does not apply
Accountability of participants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Concept of consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Diversity of expertise, talents and interests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Effective communication between stakeholders (language, intercultural communication,..)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency of process and procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Equity in communication between stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expert knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Financial resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Leadership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legitimacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**18. Has the stakeholder dialogue of this ISO process on SR met your expectation so far?**

completely	to a great extent	satisfactorily	to a small degree	not at all
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

→ Why?

---



---



---



---



This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins or other markings on the paper.

Contact details: Maud Schmiedeknecht . Konstanz Institute for Intercultural Management, Values and Communication . Brauneggerstr. 55 . 78462 Konstanz . Germany . Phone: +49 7531 206 637 . Fax: +49 7531 206 87 637 . Mail: [schmiedeknecht@htwg-konstanz.de](mailto:schmiedeknecht@htwg-konstanz.de)